1975

Managing human services

Betsy W. Romain
Portland State University

MANAGING HUMAN SERVICES

by

Betsy W. Romain

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1975

APPROVED:

Gerald A. Frey, Associate Professor of Social Work

December 19, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Professional schools have realized for some time that there is an uncomfortable gap between the requirements of their academic curriculum and the realities of a professional job. The skills required, performance level and final product, are noticeably different in the academic world than in the work world. This void between what is required in school and what is required on the job, has become of increasing concern as larger numbers of academically qualified students compete for a decreasingly smaller number of jobs. Additionally, institutes of higher education, caught in current day fiscal realities, are under pressure from both students and the community to produce programs that are relevant to the external world and practitioners who are trained to function in that world.

Especially in the social sciences and particularly in social work, there is a need to bridge this gap between the academic and work environment. The trend toward utilization of para-professionals in direct service settings combined with increasing national pressure for accountability in social welfare program expenditures has furthered the social work dilemma. Social workers must be either prepared to perform in planning, management and administrative positions or run the risk of becoming an obsolete group--too expensive for some jobs, too under-trained for others.

With these realities in mind, the School of Social Work at Portland State University applied for and received a grant from the Social

Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to begin to examine those skills which are required by middle management personnel in the human service field. The purpose of the project was to develop a curriculum for social work students whose career goals were in the areas of administration, management and planning and which would also include performance measures on which to test for competency. The project was thus entitled, "Performance in Management."

As an initial step, a series of open ended interviews were held with chief executives in the State of Oregon. These included conferences with executives and policy makers in the State's Department of Human Resources, Multnomah County's Department of Human Services and the City of Portland's Bureau of Human Resources. The purpose of these meetings was both to alert top management to the project's existence and also to solicit from them information on skills and personal attributes they thought their personnel in managerial and staff positions should have. Consequently, this information was utilized in the construction of the interview schedule.

The project goal was to isolate the skills, experiences and theoretical knowledge necessary to the performance of certain management and administrative positions in public human service agencies and then to incorporate these findings into a curriculum for the school of social work. Although the school has offered a community organization curriculum since 1969, it has recently decided to redesign this program to concentrate in social welfare planning. Consequently, this project is designed to have a direct relationship to the development of a social welfare planning curriculum at the school of social work.

The purpose of this report is to relay the results of our study with

particular attention to the findings relating to the personnel employed by the State of Oregon in human service agencies. Since our major concern was with social work education, our findings will be discussed in terms of social work issues, social work education issues, as well as, issues in management. Furthermore, since our sample were all employed by governmental bodies, these issues will also be discussed in terms of political, social and economic considerations of management in public human service agencies.

CHAPTER II

PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

Project Goal and Objectives

The goal of the project, as stated in the initial proposal, was "to develop social welfare administration, management, and planning curriculum based upon a performance education model." Consequently, three objectives were identified as essential to achievement of the project's goal. They included:

(1) To identify, catalogue, and prioritize skills used by middle management personnel in a variety of social welfare agencies both urban and rural in the state of Oregon.

(2) To design curriculum content in management and planning that is closely related to the current practice requirements of middle management social welfare personnel.

(3) To formulate performance measurements that can demonstrate competence in the specific management and planning skills that are designed for the curriculum.

Method

As an initial step, interviews were held with twenty-two executives and policy makers employed in human service agencies on both the local and state level. This information was used in the construction of the final instrument employed to interview middle-management and staff personnel in these agencies.

Instrument. Our instrument was a closed-ended interview schedule, a sample of which is attached to this report as Addendum I. Basically, we sought to determine how individuals in managerial or staff positions spend their time, what skills they identified as essential to the performance of their present position, and what education or experience they possessed. In other words, we asked them what they did on their job and what experience or education they needed to the performance of that job. With the one exception of asking interviewees to identify what they considered the important differences between managerial and staff positions, we did not attempt to measure attitudes. We also did not attempt to evaluate how effectively our respondents performed the skills they identified as essential to their position. We merely attempted to isolate the skills, general knowledge, theoretical background and personal attributes which they identified as critical to the performance of their present job.

Sample. The total sample contained fifty-eight individuals, twenty-eight of which were employed by local jurisdictions and thirty of which were employed by the State of Oregon. Geographically, the sample included individuals located in three counties, Multnomah, Jackson and Malheur, which respectively represent the state's northern-urban, southern-rural and eastern-rural populations. Additionally, we interviewed individuals located in state agencies, both in central services located in Oregon's capitol, Salem, and in local jurisdictions located in the previous three counties. This report will focus only on those individuals employed at the state level.

Rationale. Justification for utilizing this type of procedure is found in a review of the project goal and objectives outlined earlier.

In order to develop a social welfare curriculum for administrative, management or planning students based on a performance education model, it was necessary to first identify the skills, knowledge, personal attributes, educational and experiential requirements mandatory to the performance of those positions in public human service agencies. Additionally, there was some interest in determining whether there were any differences, and to what extent, between managerial and staff positions, between local and state employees, between rural and urban environments, which might have some effect on the training of social work students.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

I. DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Sample

The entire survey covered fifty-eight individuals, twenty-eight of which were employed by local jurisdictions and thirty of which were employed by the state of Oregon. This report is specifically concerned with those thirty state employees, located at both the state and local level, or approximately 52% of the total sample.

Employment Location. Within the sample of thirty, nineteen (63%) were employed in central state agencies, located in Oregon's capitol, Salem.[1] Eleven (37%) were employed in state agencies located in local jurisdictions, specifically in the counties of Multnomah, Malheur and Jackson.[2]

TABLE I

EMPLOYMENT LOCATION

Location	No.	%
State-Central	19	63
State-Local	11	37
Total	30	100%

Job Classification. Two-thirds of the group defined their job classification as manager,[3] while one-third saw themselves in administrative staff positions.[4] This ratio was essentially the same for both

state-central and state-local employees with the latter slightly higher.

TABLE II

JOB CLASSIFICATION

Job Classification	State-Central		State-Local		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Manager	12	63	8	72	20	67
Staff	7	36	3	27	10	33

Problem Focus. Approximately three-quarters of the respondents saw the problem focus of their agency as having a multi-focus,[5] while about one-quarter considered their agency to have a single-focus.[6]

TABLE III

PROBLEM FOCUS

Problem Focus	State-Central		State-Local		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Multi-focus	17	89	6	54	23	77
Single-focus	2	10	5	45	7	23

Experience. Interestingly enough, these employees had been in their present position a relatively short time, an average of thirty-two months or about two and two-third years. They had, however, considerable experience in the human service field. The average was about sixteen years, although they had been in planning or management on an average of only ten years.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF TIME IN PRESENT POSITION,
HUMAN SERVICE FIELD AND MANAGEMENT POSITION

Time in Position	State-Central	State-Local	Total
Months in present position	Mean: 33.3 Range: 2-130	30.7 3-84	32.4 2-130
Years in human service field	Mean: 17.8 Range: 4-30	12.5 4-22	15.9 4-30
Years in planning or management	Mean: 11.6 Range: 1-29	7.6 1-15	10.2 1-29
	(N=19)	(N=11)	(N=30)

Race and Sex. Finally, two-thirds of the sample were male, while one-third were female. There was one non-white male and one non-white female, both of whom were employed in local settings.

TABLE V

RACE AND SEX BY LOCALITY

Race and Sex	State-Central		State-Local		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male-white	14	73	5	45	19	63
Male-nonwhite	-	-	1	9	1	3
Female-white	5	26	4	36	9	30
Female-nonwhite	-	-	1	9	1	3

II. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Formal Education. Out of the thirty individuals interviewed, a full 90% (N=27) had received an undergraduate degree. Fifteen or 56% received their undergraduate degree in a social science major, while twelve or 44% received their degree in another academic discipline.

TABLE VI

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE BY LOCALITY

Undergraduate Degree	State-Central		State-Local		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Social Science Major	12	63	3	27	15	50
Other Bachelor	6	31	6	54	12	40
None	2	18	1	5	3	10

Seventy-three percent (N=22) went on to receive a graduate degree, while 27% (N=22) held no graduate degree. Of the twenty-two who held masters degrees, 41% had a masters in Social Work, 55% had a masters in a field other than social work and 4% had a doctorate degree. Consequently, out of a sample of thirty, 90% held undergraduate degrees, 73% went on to receive a graduate degree and only 18% of the individuals who had an undergraduate degree did not go on for a higher degree.

TABLE VII

LAST GRADUATE DEGREE BY LOCALITY

Graduate Degree	State-Central		State-Local		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Masters of Social Work	5	26	4	36	9	30
Other Masters	9	47	3	27	12	40
Doctorate	1	5	-	-	1	3
No Graduate Degree	4	21	4	36	8	27

Years Since Formal Education. There was a wide range in the number of years since the participants received their undergraduate degree, 0-41 years, with the mean falling at 16.7 years. There was also a wide range in years since the last graduate degree at 0-32 years with the mean falling at 8.8 years. As one can observe from Table VIII, there were no dramatic differences between the state-central and state-local groups in terms of this information.

TABLE VIII

YEARS SINCE FORMAL EDUCATION
BY LOCALITY

Years Since Degree	State-Central	State-Local	Total
Undergraduate degree	Mean: 17.9	14.7	16.7
	Range: 0-41	0-38	0-41
Graduate degree	Mean: 9.6	7.5	8.8
	Range: 0-26	0-32	0-32
	(N=19)	(N=11)	(N=30)

Awareness in College of Future Management Role. We were interested in finding out how many of the respondents were aware during their formal education that they would be going into a management position. When we asked this question, we found a generally equal division between those who were aware in college of a future management role (52%) and those who were not (48%).

TABLE IX

AWARENESS IN COLLEGE OF FUTURE MANAGEMENT ROLE
BY LOCALITY

Locality	Yes	No	DNA
State-central	N: 9	9	1
	%: 47	47	6
State-local	N: 5	4	2
	%: 45	36	18
State-total	N: 14	13	3
	%: 47	43	10

Specific Education. When asked to specify the particular education or training received, a full 83% of the respondents indicated that they had training or education in management theory, management by objectives, problem analysis and interviewing techniques. Seventy-seven

percent indicated that they had training or education in problem solving techniques and program evaluation, and 73% in organizational theory. In addition, over 50% of the sample had education or training in program management, task group dynamics, systems theory, community development and planning theory. Less than 50% had education or training in public presentation, legislative process, personnel management, professional writing, financial management, office administration, labor negotiations and data systems, ranging from 47% to 20% respectively.

TABLE X

SPECIFIC EDUCATION OR TRAINING

Education or Training	No. (Total = 30)	%
Management Theory	25	83%
Interviewing Techniques	25	83%
Problem Analysis	25	83%
Management by Objectives	25	83%
Problem Solving Techniques	23	77%
Problem Evaluation	23	77%
Organizational Theory	22	73%
Program Management	21	70%
Task Group Dynamics	20	67%
Systems Theory	19	63%
Community Development	16	53%
Planning Theory	15	50%
Public Presentation	14	47%
Legislative Process	13	43%
Personnel Management	12	40%
Professional Writing	10	33%
Financial Management	9	30%
Office Administration	8	27%
Labor Negotiations	6	20%
Data Systems	6	20%

Consequently, one might state that this group received a generalist education with a relevant theoretical base and accompanying technical skills. General theoretical and technical skills seem to appear more

frequently than 50% of the time, while the more specific skill categories appear less often than 50% of the time.

III. MANAGER AND STAFF POSITIONS

A major research objective was to determine whether or not, and to what degree, differences existed in the traits, skills and knowledge an individual in a management position should have as opposed to an individual in a staff position. A manager was defined as an individual who was responsible for an agency component or program and who had staff reporting directly to him. A staff position was considered to be an individual responsible primarily for his/her own work and perhaps one or two others.

Consequently, a portion of the interview asked the participant to rank in the order they deemed important the following items, first for a manager and then for a staff position.

1) Personal traits and characteristics.
2) Broad based knowledge of human service field.
3) In depth knowledge of specific human service field.
4) Broad based knowledge of management.
5) In depth knowledge of specific management area.

As is apparent, two major points were being considered; (1) difference between personal traits as opposed to knowledge and (2) difference in degree of skill or knowledge (in depth or broad based) needed in management or staff positions.

As Table XI indicates, personal traits and characteristic was ranked as most important for both staff and managerial positions. A "broad based knowledge in management" was ranked second for managers and

third for administrative staff positions, and conversely, a "broad based knowledge in the human service field" was ranked second for staff positions and third for management positions. An "in depth knowledge of the specific human service field was ranked fourth for both staff and managerial positions respectively. Finally, an in depth knowledge of a specific management area was ranked fifth for both manager and staff positions.

TABLE XI

RANKING OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPE AND DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE BY RESPONDENTS

Category	Managers	Staff
Personal Characteristics	2.48	2.31
Broad Management	2.72	2.79
Broad Human Service	2.76	2.63
In depth Human Service	3.29	3.20
In depth Management	3.66	3.90

Thus, the interviewees recognized only minor differences in the requirements of managerial or staff positions, with the one exception of putting more emphasis on broad based managerial skills for managers and broad based human service skills for staff positions. Basically, personal traits and characteristics, along with broad, general skills, received greater emphasis than specific in depth abilities. The view of this group that managerial and staff positions in human service agencies are generalist rather than specialist positions conforms with the findings of our total sample as the following table indicates.

TABLE XII

RANKING OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND
TYPE AND DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE
BY TOTAL SAMPLE (N=58)

Category	Managers	Staff
Personal Characteristics	2.47	2.45
Broad Management	2.69	3.06
Broad Human Service	2.71	2.71
In depth Human Service	3.52	3.08
In depth Management	3.94	3.86

A further analysis of the state employees reveals that there are some differences between the state-local group and the state-central group. In the latter, there is a greater emphasis on the human service background for the manager than in the total sample which stressed broad based skills.

TABLE XIII

RANKING OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND
TYPE AND DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE
BY STATE-CENTRAL SAMPLE (N=19)

Category	Managers	Staff
Personal Characteristics	2.55	2.39
Broad Human Service	2.83	2.68
In depth Human Service	3.0	3.63
Broad Management	3.10	2.44
In depth Management	3.40	3.55

In the former group, state-local, the emphasis was also on human service skills, but this time in the staff position.

TABLE XIV

RANKING OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND
TYPE AND DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE
BY STATE-LOCAL SAMPLE (N=11)

Category	Staff	Manager
Personal Characteristics	2.18	2.36
In depth Human Service	2.45	3.73
Broad Human Service	2.54	2.63
Broad Management	3.36	2.18
In depth Management	4.45	4.09

Concluding, personal traits and characteristics and an in depth knowledge of management consistently remain in the first and last positions respectively, while there is some variance between the state-local and state-central employees responses for the second, third and fourth positions. Human service skills are emphasized for the state-central manager and the state-local staff positions, while broad based skills (either management or human service) generate the most concern for the total sample.

IV. TIME EXPENDITURE

An individual's work role and consequently the skills utilized in the performance of that role are defined to a large extent by the manner in which one is required to spend time. In an effort to determine where and to what extent managers and staff spend their time, a series of questions were asked relating to time expenditure.

Job time was divided into four categories, (1) time spent in areas external to the job; (2) time spent in program management; (3) time spent in financial management; and (4) time spent in personnel management. The interviewees were asked to indicate the relative percentage

of time they spent in each category, based on a cumulative total of 100%.

As Table XV reveals, three-quarters of our groups' time was spent in program management or dealing with external forces with the remaining two categories (personnel, financial management) being fairly equally divided. The remaining one-quarter of the time was spent in personnel or financial management respectively, again, generally equally divided.

TABLE XV

PERCENT OF TIME EXPENDITURES OF STATE SAMPLE BY FUNCTION

Function	Range	Mean
Program Management	10-85%	37.8%
External Forces	5-80%	37.0%
Personnel Management	0-70%	12.0%
Financial Management	0-40%	10.7%

A comparison of the state group (N=30) to the total sample (N=58) reveals a similarity of time expenditure. The majority of time was again spent in program management or external forces with personnel and financial management occupying the last positions once more.

TABLE XVI

TIME EXPENDITURES OF STATE SAMPLE COMPARED TO TOTAL SAMPLE

Function	State-Sample	Total-Sample
Program Management	37.8%	36.2%
External Forces	37.0%	34.0%
Personnel Management	12.0%	15.5%
Financial Management	10.7%	13.2%

Thus, one might conclude that the majority of time is spent in either program management or dealing with external bodies. About one-quarter of this group's time is spent in the more categorical areas of

personnel and financial management. Consequently, the sample spends most of their time in general administrative and programmatic areas as opposed to the more specialized tasks of personnel and financial management.

These findings are not particularly surprising and in fact correspond to the basic organizational structure of public bodies. Bureaucracies generally employ large numbers of people and operate within a complex fiscal environment necessitating that both personnel and financial matters be handled by specialized departments. Thus, the managers interviewed in this study spend a minimum of their time in these two areas.

A closer look at the state employee group reveals some minor variations between those individuals employed at the local level and those individuals employed at the central level. As Table XVII reveals, although the majority of time for all individuals is still spent in external and program areas, there is a noticeable difference in the degree.

TABLE XVII

TIME EXPENDITURE OF STATE-LOCAL COMPARED TO STATE-CENTRAL SAMPLE

Function	State-Local	State-Central
Program Management	28.6%	43.2%
External Forces	42.3%	33.9%
Personnel Management	16.8%	9.2%
Financial Management	12.3%	9.8%

In the state-local population, the percent of time spent in external forces is much greater than the percent of time spent in the next largest category, program management. Conversely, in the state-central sample, the greatest percent of time is spent in program management and it is again somewhat greater than the percent of time spent in the next

largest category, external forces.

Thus, state personnel employed at the local level spend considerable more time dealing with external bodies then do state employees working at the central level, who spend more time in program management. This data tends to confirm general impressions of the different roles of state-local and state-central agencies, with the former having more contact with and responsibility to the community-client population and the latter having less contact with the community-client population and more responsibility towards management and administrative functions.

Within each of the four general categories of time expenditure, additional specific functions were listed. We asked the interviewees to rank, relative to the time spent within the general category, the specific functions. The findings for the total state sample are summarized in the following table.

TABLE XVIII

SUMMARY OF TIME EXPENDITURE
FOR TOTAL STATE SAMPLE
(1 is high)

General Category	Specific Function	Range	Mean	Rank Mean
Program Management		10-85%	37.8%	
	Program Planning			1.52
	Program Administration			1.74
	Program Evaluation			2.62
External Forces		5-80%	37.0%	
	Administrative Bodies			1.52
	Community Groups			1.82
	Legislation			2.65
	Labor & Civil Service Negotiations			3.78
Personnel Management		0-70%	12.0%	
	Allocation			1.21
	Personnel Development			1.90
	Recruitment & Selection			2.95
	Affirmative Action			3.79

TABLE XVIII-Continued

General Category	Specific Function	Range	Mean	Rank Mean
Financial Management		0-40%	10.7%	
	Financial Planning			1.59
	Financial Administration			2.0
	Financial Evaluation			2.87
	Revenue Development			3.12

As is apparent, within the largest category in terms of time expenditure, program management, program planning was ranked first most often, program administration, second and program evaluation, third. As Table XIX indicates, differences between the state group and our entire sample were minimal.

TABLE XIX

RANKING OF FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO TIME SPENT IN PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Program Management Function	State-Sample Rank Mean	Total-Sample Rank Mean
Program Planning	1.52	1.77
Program Administration	1.74	1.77
Program Evaluation	2.62	2.61

Within external forces, the second largest category in terms of time expenditure, administrative bodies was ranked first, community groups was second, third was legislative groups and labor and civil service negotiations were ranked last. Again as the following table displays, this order directly corresponds with the findings of the total sample.

TABLE XX

RANKING OF FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO TIME SPENT IN EXTERNAL FORCES

External Forces Function	State-Sample Rank Mean	Total-Sample Rank Mean
Administrative Bodies	1.52	1.64
Community Groups	1.82	1.91
Legislation	2.65	3.08
Labor & Civil Service Negotiations	3.78	4.03

In our third category, personnel management, we found that personnel allocation, tasks assignments and need assessments was ranked first most often. Next came personnel development, recruitment and selection was third and affirmative action was last. As before, there was no diversity in findings between the state-sample and the total group.

TABLE XXI

RANKING OF FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO TIME SPENT IN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Personnel Management Function	State-Sample Rank Mean	Total-Sample Rank Mean
Allocation	1.21	1.83
Personnel Development	1.90	2.61
Recruitment and Selection	2.95	3.37
Affirmative Action	3.79	3.86

Finally, in the last category, financial management, financial planning was ranked first most often with financial administration second and financial evaluation, third. Revenue development was ranked last. In this general category, there were some differences in the ranking of functions between the state interviewees and the total group. As Table XXII shows the state sample had a slightly wider range of means and tended to put more emphasis on planning and less on evaluation

than the total group.

TABLE XXII

RANKING OF FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO TIME SPENT IN FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Financial Management Function	State-Sample Rank Mean	Total-Sample Rank Mean
Financial Planning	1.59	2.47
Financial Administration	2.0	2.46
Financial Evaluation	2.87	2.47
Revenue Development	3.12	3.62

Looking at the state interviewees more closely, there were a number of differences between those employed at the local level and those employed in central agencies. As previously mentioned, the state-local sample (n=11) spent the most amount of time dealing with external bodies, as opposed to the rest of the group which spent the most amount of time in program management. The state-local individuals were the only ones to rank community groups first in specific time expenditures; the remainder of the individuals generally ranked administrative bodies first. This reconfirms our earlier notion that there is more emphasis and hence more community responsiveness at the state-local level.

Like the rest of the group, the state-local sample spent the least amount of time in financial management. Unlike the rest of the sample, however, state-local employees put more emphasis on financial administration than financial planning.

In sum, there are some minor variations among the state individuals when one looks at the state-local and state-central divisions separately. However, there are basically no dramatic differences, nor anything that warrants more than a passing notation.

V. SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

Based on our initial interviews with executives and policy makers, we developed an extensive list of skills, knowledge, experience and personal attributes that they identified as important for personnel in management and administrative positions. We divided these items into four major areas; (1) experience, (2) personal attributes, (3) knowledge and (4) skills, and then further delineated the skill category into three major divisions; communication skills, change agent skills, and management skills. We thus developed a total of six major categories; (1) experience, (2) personal attributes, (3) general knowledge, (4) communication skill, (5) change agent skills and (6) management skills.

Within these six major divisions, we listed a series of appropriate skills, knowledge, experience or personal attributes. For example, within experience, we listed direct service experience, management experience, etc.; within communication skills we listed interviewing, report writing, public presentation, and so forth. See the sample interview form which is attached to this report as Addendum I.

In an effort to determine the relationship between particular skills and job responsibilities, we asked each interviewee to consider each specific area according to its importance to his or her present position. We asked them to rate each area as either:

Rate 1 - essential to present position
Rate 2 - useful but not essential to present position
Rate 3 - neither essential nor useful to present position.

Table XXIII summarizes our findings by indicating the frequency with which both major categories and specific areas appeared as essential.

In order to insure clarity in the proceeding discussion, the data will be presented first in terms of the six major categories and then in terms of the specific areas within each major subdivision.

TABLE XXIII

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL RATING
OF MAJOR CATEGORIES AND SPECIFIC AREAS
BY TOTAL STATE GROUP

Major Category	Specific Area	%	No.
Communication Skills	Observational	100%	30
Personal Attributes	Analytical	97	29
Personal Attributes	Interpersonal	93	28
Personal Attributes	Level headed	90	27
Communication Skills	Report Writing	83	25
Personal Attributes	Output Orientation	80	24
Personal Attributes	Commitment to Human Service Values	80	24
General Knowledge	Organizational Theory	80	24
Management Skills	Planning/Development	80	24
Management Skills	Evaluation	80	24
Management Skills	Crisis Management	80	24
Experience	Broad	77	23
Personal Attributes	Leadership	77	23
Personal Attributes	Innovation	77	23
Personal Attributes	Drive	77	23
General Knowledge	Management Theory	77	23
Change Agent Skills	Organizational Dev.	77	23
Experience	Planning/Evaluation	73	22
Communication Skills	Public Presentation	73	22
Communication Skills	Task Group Meetings	73	22
General Knowledge	Political Process	73	22
Personal Attributes	Personal Growth	73	22
Management Skills	Program Operation	70	21
Management Skills	Data Use	70	21
Experience	Direct Service	67	20
Experience	Management	67	20
General Knowledge	Systems Theory	63	19
General Knowledge	Human Growth	63	19
General Knowledge	Social Policy Theory	60	18
Communication Skills	Interviewing	60	18
Change Agent Skills	Resource Development	60	18
Management Skills	Personnel	53	16
Management Skills	Financial	50	15
General Knowledge	Small Group Theory	50	15
Change Agent Skills	Community Organization	47	14
General Knowledge	Legislative Process	47	14

TABLE XXIII-Continued

Major Category	Specific Area	%	No.
General Knowledge	Legal Process	47	14
Personal Attributes	Physical Appearance	43	13
Management Skills	Office Administration	43	13
Change Agent Skills	Political Action	33	10
Communication Skills	Proposals and Grants	30	9
Experience	Business	10	3

Major Categories

Table XXIV lists the major category and specific area by mean. The average of all the means falls around 1.37. That is to say, if all the mean rankings of the specific areas are added up, the average is around 1.37. The average mean of the upper 25% of our data falls around 1.20. In order to determine the general positions and frequency of occurrence of the major categories among the total data, we have chosen to approach the findings in the following manner:

(1) % of time major category appears above mean of 1.20 (upper $\frac{1}{4}$)

(2) % of time major category appears above mean of 1.37 (upper $\frac{1}{2}$)

(3) % of time major category appears below mean of 1.37 (lower $\frac{1}{2}$)

As Table XXIV indicates, personal traits and characteristics have a mean of 1.20 50% of the time. Management skills have a mean of 1.20 or higher 38% of the time and communication skills, 33% of the time. General knowledge falls in this upper one quarter 11% of the time, while the remaining two major categories of experience and change agent skills do not appear above this 1.20 average mean cut-off point.

Collapsing the data further to discover which major categories fall in the upper one-half, or have means greater than 1.37, it appears that 90% of the time personal traits and characteristics have a mean of 1.37

or more and 67% of the time communication skills have a mean of 1.37 or more. Additionally, management skills fall into this category 63% of the time, experience 60% of the time and general knowledge 44% of the time. Change agent skills have a mean of 1.37 or more 25% of the time.

TABLE XXIV

SUMMARY OF RANKINGS OF MAJOR CATEGORY AND SPECIFIC AREA BY MEAN

Major Category	Specific Area	Mean (1=highest)
Communication Skills	Observational	1.00
Personal Attributes	Analytical	1.03
Personal Attributes	Interpersonal	1.06
Personal Attributes	Level-headed	1.10
Communication Skills	Report Writing	1.16
Personal Attributes	Commitment to Human Values	1.17
Personal Attributes	Output Orientation	1.20
General Knowledge	Organizational Theory	1.20
Management Skills	Planning/Development	1.20
Management Skills	Evaluation	1.20
Management Skills	Crisis Management	1.20
Experience	Broad	1.23
Personal Attributes	Innovative	1.23
Personal Attributes	Drive	1.23
Personal Attributes	Leadership	1.26
Personal Attributes	Personal Growth	1.26
Experience	Planning & Evaluation	1.26
General Knowledge	Management Theory	1.26
Communication Skills	Task Group Meeting	1.27
Communication Skills	Public Presentation	1.30
General Knowledge	Political Process	1.30
Change Agent Skills	Organizational Dev.	1.30
Management Skills	Data Use	1.31
Management Skills	Program Operation	1.33
General Knowledge	Systems Theory	1.36
Experience	Direct Service	1.36
Experience	Management	1.40
Communications Skills	Interviewing	1.40
General Knowledge	Human Growth	1.43
General Knowledge	Social Policy Theory	1.43
Change Agent Skills	Resource Development	1.46
General Knowledge	Small Group Theory	1.56
Management Skills	Personnel	1.56
Management Skills	Financial	1.60

TABLE XXIV-Continued

Major Category	Specific Area	Mean (1=highest)
General Knowledge	Legislative Process	1.60
General Knowledge	Legal Process	1.60
Management Skills	Office Administration	1.63
Personal Attributes	Physical Appearance	1.70
Change Agent Skills	Community Organization	1.70
Change Agent Skills	Political Action	1.73
Communication Skills	Proposal & Grants	1.83
Experience	Business	2.10

To summarize, looking at the top one-quarter (25%) of the data, the flow of major categories in the order of importance they appeared to an individual's present position looks like this:

TABLE XXV

SUMMARY OF PERCENT OF TIME
MAJOR CATEGORY APPEARS
IN UPPER 25%

Major Category	Percent of Time
Personal Traits	50%
Management Skills	38%
Communication Skills	33%
General Knowledge	11%
Experience	-
Change Agent Skills	-

If we look at the same data in terms of the top one-half (50%) of the means, the flow of major categories in order of importance to present position looks like this.

TABLE XXVI

SUMMARY OF PERCENT OF TIME
MAJOR CATEGORY APPEARS
IN UPPER 50%

Major Category	Percent of Time
Personal Traits	90%
Communication Skills	67%
Management Skills	63%
Experience	60%
General Knowledge	44%
Change Agent Skills	25%

A comparison of Tables XXV and XXVI makes it apparent that personal traits and change agent skills are firmly entrenched in the first and last positions respectively. Additionally, although there are minor variations in the places of communication and management skills between the second and third positions, and experience and general knowledge between the third and fourth positions, the top three major categories remain in the top three slots and the bottom three major categories remain in the bottom three slots.

Specific Areas

As previously noted, we asked the sample to rate various characteristics as either (1) essential; (2) useful but not essential or (3) neither useful nor essential to their present position. The findings indicate that the majority of respondents found most areas as either essential or useful to their present position and very few utilized the third "neither useful nor essential" choice. Consequently, the majority of discussion here will be concerned with the two major areas of "essential" and "useful" to present position.

Personal Attributes. Under personal traits and characteristics,

the ability to be analytical, level headed and to conduct good interpersonal relationships were all rated as essential 90% of the time or more. Commitment to human values and output orientation was rated as essential 80% of the time, and the somewhat internal qualities of leadership, drive and innovation, as well as, the ability to grow personally were rated as essential 70% of the time or more. Physical appearance, the least important in this category, was ranked as both essential and useful 43% of the time respectively and as neither essential or useful 13% of the time.

TABLE XXVII

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS
UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

Personal Attributes	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1=high)
Analytical	29	97	1	3			1.03
Interpersonal	28	93	2	7			1.06
Level-headed	27	90	3	10			1.10
Output	24	80	6	20			1.20
Commitment to Human Values	23	80	5	17	(1 n.r.)		1.17
Innovation	23	77	7	23			1.23
Drive	23	77	7	23			1.23
Leadership	23	77	6	20	1	3	1.26
Personal Growth	22	73	8	27			1.26
Physical Appearance	13	43	13	43	4	13	1.70

Communication Skills. Observational skills were rated as essential 100% of the time, the highest rating in the sample. Report writing was rated as essential 83% of the time, and task group meetings and public presentation, 73% of the time. Additionally, interviewing was rated as essential 60% of the time and useful 40% of the time, while proposal and grant writing came in surprisingly low at essential, 30% of the time,

useful, 57% of the time and neither essential nor useful 13% of the time.

TABLE XXVIII

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS
UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF
COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Communication Skills	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1=high)
Observational Skills	30	100					1.00
Report Writing	25	83	5	17			1.16
Task Group Meeting	22	73	6	20	1 (1 n.r.3)	3	1.27
Public Presentation	22	73	7	23	1	3	1.30
Interviewing	18	60	12	40			1.40
Proposal & Grants	9	30	17	57	4	13	1.83

Management Skills. In this major category, planning and development, evaluation and crisis management were all rated as essential 80% of the time and useful 20% of the time. Data use and program operation were considered essential to present position a full 70% of the time and personnel, financial and office administration skills were listed as essential 53%, 50% and 40% respectively.

TABLE XXIX

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS
UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF
MANAGEMENT SKILLS

Management Skills	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1=high)
Planning/Development	24	80	6	20			1.20
Evaluation	24	80	6	20			1.20
Crisis Management	24	80	6	20			1.20
Data Use	21	70	7	23	1 (1 n.r.3)	3	1.31
Program Operation	21	70	8	27	1	3	1.33
Personnel	16	53	11	37	3	10	1.56
Financial	15	50	12	40	3	10	1.60
Office Administration	13	43	15	50	2	7	1.63

Experience. Generally, experience or background was rated lower than the preceeding three categories. Broad experience and experience in planning and evaluation faired best as essential 70% of the time or more. Experience in direct service and management appeared somewhat less essential at 67%. Only 10% of respondents considered business experience essential, with the majority (67%) feeling that it was useful and 20% indicating that it was neither useful nor essential. It is interesting to note that in this third option, "neither useful nor essential," business experience appeared the most often at 20%.

TABLE XXX

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF EXPERIENCE

Experience	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1=high)
Broad	23	77	7	23			1.23
Planning & Evaluation	22	73	8	27			1.26
Direct Service	20	67	9	30	1	3	1.36
Management	20	67	8	27	2	6	1.40
Business	3	10	20	67	6	20	2.10
					(1 n.r. 3)		

General Knowledge. This category covered a spectrum from theoretical information to actual processes and ranged in the essential category from a high of 80% for organizational theory to a low of 47% for the legislative and legal processes. Management theory and political process ranked close to organizational theory and were considered essential by 77% and 73% of the sample respectively. Systems theory, social policy theory, small group theory and human growth and development were ranked essential at least 50% of the time.

TABLE XXXI

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS
UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF
GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

General Knowledge	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1=high)
Organizational Theory	24	80	6	20			1.20
Management Theory	23	77	6	20	1	3	1.26
Political Process	22	73	7	23	1	3	1.30
Systems Theory	19	63	11	37			1.36
Human Growth	19	63	9	30	2	7	1.43
Social Policy Theory	18	60	11	37	1	3	1.43
Small Group Theory	15	50	13	43	2	7	1.56
Legislative Process	14	47	14	47	2	6	1.60
Legal Process	14	47	14	47	2	6	1.60

Change Agent Skills. Change agent skills were considered as the least essential by the group. Organizational development received the highest rating in this category, with 77% of our sample indicating that it was essential to their present position, 16% indicating that it was useful and 7% considering it neither useful nor essential. Resource development was rated as essential by only 60% of the sample and community organization was considered essential by only 47% of the respondents. Political action received one of the lowest ratings at 33%, essential, although 60% considered it useful. It is interesting to note that besides business experience which 20% of the interviewees considered neither useful nor essential, community organization received the next highest rank in that least essential category at 16%.

TABLE XXXII

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF SPECIFIC AREAS
UNDER MAJOR CATEGORY OF
CHANGE AGENT SKILLS

Change Agent Skills	Essential		Useful		Neither		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	(1-high)
Organizational Development	23	77	5	16	2	7	1.30
Resource Development	18	60	10	33	2	7	1.46
Community Organization	14	47	11	37	5	16	1.70
Political Action	10	33	18	60	2	7	1.73

Summary. To summarize, at the very top of our essential list, are categories that describe a particular orientation to management and administrative roles in the human service field. The sample says that it is essential that an individual by analytical, level-headed, be able to respond well in a crisis and thus be "rational." One must have good observational and interpersonal skills and have a basic commitment to human service values. Furthermore, one must be able to produce, must be output oriented, know how to write a report and have planning, development and evaluation skills. Finally, one must have a knowledge of organizational theory, understand how an organization works and how to thereby function effectively within it.

The rest of the data supports this picture of a rational, productive, generally skilled manager, who nevertheless still holds certain traditional social work values (eg. commitment to human values) as essential. Experience and a theoretical base are less important than specific management and communication skills, and personal characteristics such as innovation, drive and leadership appear frequently as essential. Besides organizational development, change agent skills are generally not essential, as are any of the skills or knowledge in political and

legislative areas. Finally, skills which relate to generally specialized departments in public agencies, such as personnel and financial management skills, office administration and proposal and grant writing, rate very low on our essential list.

Comparison of State Sample to Total Group

There does not appear to be any major difference between the responces of the state sample and those of the total group, especially if one surveys the data in terms of the general flow of most essential and least essential categories. Where there are discrepancies, the state sample, by and large, ranks specific areas as more essential, then does the total group. There are a few exceptions worth noting.

The state group rates both organizational theory (essential 80% of the time) and data use (essential 70% of the time) higher than does the total group at 67% and 50% essential respectively. Moreover, the total group considers drive and energy essential 93% of the time, while the state respondents consider it essential only 77% of the time. None of this appears particularly surprising since it is logical to presume that large centralized departments such as found on the state level would have more interest in both organizational development and data use than would smaller, localized units. Furthermore, although state employees rate drive and energy as relatively low, they also consider output orientation as essential 80% of the time. In sum, given the basic organizational and philosophical structure of government bureaucracies, these divergences are neither revealing nor surprising.

Comparison of State-Local and State-Central Groups

A closer look at the total state sample reveals minor differences between those employees located at a local level or a central level. The general flow from most essential skills, experience, personal traits and general knowledge to least essential, is basically the same. Discrepancies within specific areas were very minor, with items interchanging positions, for example, from number two to number three.

The one notable exception was in the major category of personal attributes particularly on the state-local level. As Table XXXIII indicates the state-local group put much more emphasis on both leadership abilities and a commitment to human values than did the total sample. Conversely, the total sample put more emphasis on drive, innovation and output orientation than did the state-local respondents. Again, these variations are not particularly revealing, since one would expect a smaller, local unit which has more contact with the immediate community to feel that a basic philosophical commitment to human services combined with an ability to lead would be more essential than an output orientation. In other words, the state-local respondents put more emphasis on process than did the total group which put more emphasis on product.

TABLE XXXIII

COMPARISON OF PERSONAL ATTRIBUTE ESSENTIAL RATINGS OF STATE-LOCAL AND STATE-TOTAL GROUPS

Personal Attributes	State-Local %	State-Total %
Analytical	90	97
Interpersonal	100	93
Level headed	90	90
Output Orientation	63	80
Commitment to Human Values	90	80
Innovation	63	77
Drive	72	77

TABLE XXXIII-Continued

Personal Attributes	State-Local	State-Total
Leadership	100	77
Personal Growth	72	73
Physical Appearance	45	43

VI. SUMMARY - FINDINGS

In summary, the main objective of this study was to identify the education, experience and skills utilized by middle management personnel in public human service agencies in Oregon in order to design a graduate curriculum which would reflect the actual state of the art. In doing so, a population of human service managers was identified whose education, training and orientation is towards a generalist rather than specialist conception of management. Furthermore, the manner in which these managers used their time as well as the personal attributes, experience, skills and general knowledge they identified as critical to the performance of their jobs, confirms this generalist notion.

Although we were interested in looking at the different functions of manager and staff positions, the sample identified only minor different between the two. There were basically no discrepancies between the responses of those individuals employed by local jurisdiction and those employed by the state. Additionally, within the state sample, there were no new revelations on the role differentiation between those state employees located in central agencies as opposed to those found in local settings.

The remainder of this report will explore the implications of these findings as they relate both to management and to education. More specifically, particular attention will be paid to management in public

human service agencies and education in graduate schools of social work.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLICATIONS

> People do research for two reasons: first, because it is interesting and second because it may be useful. The relations of researchers with men of action are sometimes complicated by the fact that useful knowledge is not always interesting or interesting knowledge necessarily useful. Thus, although researchers and decision makers enjoy flirting with each other, if they are to make a serious and congenial marriage both parties must recognize . . . the kinds of circumstances in which usefulness and interest coincide.[7]

The relationship between knowledge and action, between inquiry and policy, is a tedious one at best. Research involves an inordinate amount of specialized language, systemmized procedures and elaborate classifications, which often amount to no more than a series of subtle distinctions and uninteresting definitions which provide no direct plan for the relationship of knowledge to action.[8] Moreover, in the end, if relevant conclusions do happen to appear, they often turn out to be information both the researcher and the practitioner already knew in advance. As one social scientist has suggested, "the whole process appears to be a peculiarily complicated way of saying the obvious."[9]

Compounded with this is a large and increasingly controversial gap between the findings of research studies and the utilization of those findings in the field. This has further contributed to the mutual frustration of both the social scientist and the practitioner. In this writer's opinion, the critical task that both must concern themselves with is a concise statement of the central problem to be solved. For the researcher this means that his responsibility goes beyond the

findings of his scientific analysis and for the decision maker this means that his actions go beyond the implementation of the researcher's conclusions. The payoff for both is found in the argument, the hypothesis, the problem definition, and the test of effectiveness is not in the discovery of new information, but in whether the actual process makes clear and explicit the already existing problem to be solved.[10]

"Performance in Management" has attempted to do just that. We did not find, nor did we really expect to find, any significant new information about management and administrative responsibilities in human service agencies. What we did attempt to do was to clarify the problem, identify what is needed to solve that problem and articulate a process upon which to evaluate our effectiveness.

Analygous to the conflict between knowledge and action, our problem was simply that there was no coordination between how graduate social work students are trained in school and how they are expected to perform on the job. As Ivar Berg has so well articulated, "Are academic credentials important for <u>doing</u> the job---or just for <u>getting</u> it?"[11]

Consequently, an analysis of our findings must not overly concern itself with what we found, but rather with what we plan to do with these findings. We have determined where the School is in terms of its curriculum, and where the jobs are in terms of their requirements, and now the real question becomes where we are jointly going. The solution to any problem is not simply the collection of facts, but the utilization of that information into an active problem solving process. Thus, the remainder of this analysis will concentrate on the role of management in public human service agencies and its implications for the training of

graduate social work students. Since we are really looking at policy issues in both management and education, we will use three interrelated elements in our analysis; (1) goals, which includes roles, responsibilities and tasks, (2) environment, which includes social, economic and political, and (3) instrument, which includes skills and tools for accomplishing the goals within the environment.

I. MANAGEMENT

In this study, we have attempted to answer some basic questions about management and administrative staff in human service agencies. These include:

1. Who hold manager or staff positions in human service agencies? What is their educational and experiential background? In what areas did they receive specific education or training? How many years have they been in the field?
2. What do they do? How do managers and staff spend their time?
3. What is the relationship between what they do and the skills and training they possess. In other words, what do they need. . .to do. . .what they do.

We generally found no discrepancies between the state sample and the total group, nor did we find significant differences among the state interviewees employed at the local level as opposed to those employed in centralized agencies. This was not particularly important since our research goal was action related and not to identify differences.

The majority of our sample was male and white, had finished their

undergraduate training on an average of seventeen years ago and had been employed in the human service field on an average of sixteen years. A full 90% of our interviewees held undergraduate degrees, 50% of which were in the social sciences. Of the 73% who went on to receive a graduate degree about eight years later, they were relatively equally divided among those who received an MSW (Masters of Social Work) and those who received a masters in another field. Furthermore, there was an equal division among those who were aware in college of a future management role and those who were not. On the average, they had been in their present positions almost three years but had been in management for about ten years.

Goals (Roles, Tasks and Responsibilities)

Roles. The mission of management, so to speak, has been the topic of innumerous research studies, literary reviews and intellectual dissertations. All business, whether public or private, for profit or non-profit, must deal in some way with managing its resources, its personnel, its programs and coordinating all these functions into one cohesive unit. As society becomes more complex, as resources become more scarce, the effective, efficient planning and utilization of resources becomes more and more important. Managers have been assigned the responsibility for effectively allocating agency resources to achieve the goals of that body.[12] Thus, management, in the broad sense of the word has come to mean an integrating or coordinating function.

The basic assumption is that coordinating functions are usually performed by generalist rather than specialist. The role of a coordinator is to know enough about each part and how it functions to be able to

integrate all the parts into one workable unit. Both our review of the literature and the responses of our sample support this coordinating, generalist role for the manager.[13] Accordingly, the tasks and responsibilities of today's manager are more universal than selective and the accompanying skill requirements more diffuse than specific.

At only one point in our interview did we attempt to measure attitudes. In an effort to determine whether there was a difference, and to what degree, between characteristics of a person in a staff position as opposed to a management position, we asked the interviewees to rank five categories in the order they perceived as important for those two classifications. In both cases personal traits and characteristics were ranked first and a broad based knowledge of management or human service field was ranked either second or third. The remaining two categories which specified an indepth knowledge of the same two fields occupied the last two positions. Consequently, our data suggests that it is the broad based, general knowledge which is important to the performance of staff or management jobs in the human service field.

A look at the way time is spent also confirms the coordinating position of management roles in human service agencies. The majority of the interviewees' time was spent in either program management or dealing with external forces, rather than the more technical categories of financial and personnel management. On the average a full one-third of an individual's time was spent dealing with external forces which was defined as administrative bodies, legislative bodies, community groups and organizations, and labor and civil service organizations. It is apparent, therefore, that the integrating and coordinating role of management not only exists but plays a dominant role in an individual's expenditure of

time.

The coordinating role of management is supported in the management literature. Peter Drucker, in an article entitled "Management's New Role," in the Harvard Business Review states that management's new role is to make productive for the individual, the community and the society, the new organized institutions of our new pluralism.[14] Thus, this preoccupation in our study with bodies external to the agencies, may not be a particular characteristic of management in a public agency, but rather an overall quality of management.

Tasks. The manner in which time is spent on the job, defines to a large extent both the role and the task of that job. Management's role as been previously defined as a coordinating one and the basic focus as generalist rather than specialist.

The tasks of management, thereby, are about as varied as one could expect from a generalist occupation. Peter Drucker, writing in the Harvard Business Review, sees management's task as making knowledge more productive. He claims that entrepreneurial innovation will become the heart and core of managemnt and that management, thereby, will become a means through which society makes productive its own values and beliefs.[15]

This view is supported by other writers in management literature, particularly David Lilenthal who views management as a high form of leadership.[16] The essential mark of a successful manager, he claims, is that he understands the nature of his function. And, his function is to "make things happen," to integrate technical, social, and political information and to combine it with human skills to in Drucker's words,

"make knowledge more productive."

Lilenthal claims that management is a concept, an idea, an abstraction; it does not exist. It is therefore, in the individual manager, the human being, where the key to management is found. Thus, he goes on, management's primary skill is human, not technical, and a manager must be measured in terms of his human personality, the intangible qualities of leadership.[17]

Our findings generally support this notion, although our sample did not give as high scores to leadership and innovation as perhaps Peter Drucker and David Lilenthal would have preferred. They do, however, support the notion that personal characteristics are the most important qualities of a manager. This category came in consistently highest as essential to present position.

There is a second definition of management's task which speaks more to agency or organizational objectives. Basically, this viewpoint states that the job of management is to achieve organizational goals.[18] The emphasis is on goal achievement and organizational development as the major managerial tasks, rather than on entrepreneurial and leadership qualities. In other words, the emphasis is on the product rather than the process.

This is again confirmed by our sample who rate highly managerial skills as essential to their jobs. In addition, organizational development under change agent skills and organizational theory under general knowledge both received the highest essential ratings in their respective categories.

Responsibilities. We have defined the role of management as coordination and the task as leadership (process) and achieving agency

goals (product). Management's responsibility, thereby, might be viewed as one of communication.

The development of lines of communication through which ideas, knowledge and information can be exchanged is a primary responsibility of an individual in a co-ordinating or integrating role. A manager has, what one author termed, a "bilingual" responsibility;[19] he must translate goals to action, action to measurement and between subordinates and superiors. He must thereby be able to develop communication channels, utilize communication systems and generally promote good communication.

Our interviewees also noted the importance of communication skills. As a major category, communication skills always ranked in the upper three and within the specific areas was recognized as important especially in the areas of writing and observational skills. The ability to conduct task group meetings and make a public presentation were also considered essential.

In summary, the goal of management is to integrate and coordinate. Managers are generalist, who must have personal attributes becoming to their job. Their task is dualistic in that they must possess qualities pertaining to leadership and innovation (process) and at the same time must be able to achieve agency goals (product). Thus, in order to make "knowledge more productive" they must have good communication skills.

Environment (Social, Economic and Political)

One would believe that the social, economic and political environment in which an individual, an agency a society operates, plays a dominant role in determining the values and beliefs upon which an individual, agency or society bases their judgments for decisions. The role

of management, the skills of the manager, the goals of an organization, vary based on the culture in which they are found. Thus, management practices are different in Japan than in the United States,[20] are different in public rather than private agencies, are different on the local rather than state level. While our data and our literature review did confirm that there are some differences between the local and the state level, we can not really state that the differences are as significant as we would have liked to believe. For purposes of discussion, therefore, we will discuss our sample in light of the environment in which they operate; a public rather than a private agency, an agency which is non-profit rather than for profit, an agency which operates under a democratic political system, and an agency which is part of, what has come to be called, "the welfare state."

Public Agencies. Public agencies by definition serve the public. They exist either for utilitarian, humanitarian or political reasons, and often serve all three purposes at once. Thus, we have agencies which are concerned with the business of government: safety, justice, roads; with the business of the public: health, welfare, education; and with the business of running government: legislative, research, advocacy. This study has dealt with those public agencies which generally fall under the humanitarian category, which are concerned with providing services to the public which are not necessarily related to the business of government or the business of running government. This statement, itself is subject to much debate, for the responsibilities and limits of government in this country have yet to be acceptably defined.

The most striking fact about any public agency is that it operates

not for profit, but for the "public good" and that it simultaneously exists in an overall social environment which is based on a profit incentive. The role of management in such an agency is thereby, not to use agency resources to accomplish profits, but to utilize agency resources to "serve," the public, the client, the recipient. Thus, a major problem in the human service business has been that it is neither efficient, effective, productive nor accountable. The current economic situation, however, is demanding accountability in social welfare expenditures and this, in turn, has placed the burden exactly where it belongs...on management, whose role is to coordinate, to integrate, to make knowledge more productive.

The role of management, thereby, in a public body where one must be accountable to a general body rather than one boss; where effectiveness and efficiency is not measured by having more income than expenditures at the end of the year, but rather at breaking even; where in essence the client and the donor are the same, is confusing at best. The manager in a public body, thus, really does occupy a boundary position and have an integrating role; he both serves and receives, pays and profits, is both the worker and the recipient.

A major problem for management in public bodies has been motivating factors which are directly related to issues of productivity, efficiency and accountability. Our literature review indicates that it is, in fact, the singular primary difference between management in a public and management in a private organization.

One management author suggests that the fact that managers outside the business sector do not have as high a motivation to manage "may account for the low level of effectiveness of many governmental

organizations."[21] He goes on to state that the motivation to manage has a definite impact on effectiveness, especially where the organization is (1) administrative and hierarchial in character and (2) large rather than small, two characteristics which particularly describe public agencies. He identifies attitudes contributing to success in management which include the desire to compete, assertive motivation, the desire to exercise power and a sense of responsibility.[22] None of these are particularly rewarded in public agencies, which have a bureaucratic structure where power is centralized at the top and a civil service reward and mobility system.

Although there was no attempt made in this study to measure whether motivation actually exists, but only to identify whether respondents considered it important, both drive and leadership were rated relatively high at essential 70% of the time. However, change agent skills, which seem by definition to require the most drive and energy, were consistently the lowest rated category. Additionally, in terms of education, it was impossible to identify whether respondents were or could be trained to be motivated, competitive or responsible.

Our literature review indicates that the solution to this problem might lie in financial rewards. Profit performance is a given of our economic system and salary is the most important aid to job performance.[23] This is a rather interesting dichotomy for a non-profit organization to find itself in. Chester Payne summarizes this when he states that top performance pays off, poor performance does not and that the study of motivation indicates that we should put money where performance is.[24] David Reid, writing for the United Kingdom, presents the somewhat opposite view when he states that the need to improve performance in human

services can best be met by the nationalization of this industry.[25] The dilemma, thereby, for the individual human service manager, is that he exists in a basically market place economy, but works for a non-profit organization, the government, which itself is neither able to operate consistent with the market place economy or offer its workers the guarantees of a nationalized industry.

Benson Shapiro suggests that this dilemma can be resolved by the utilization of a marketing function for non-profit agencies.[26] Competition in business can be converted into cooperation among non-profit agencies and that emphasis on the exchange process, where both the buyer and seller are satisfied with the transaction, is essential. Managers should, thus, improve their understanding of the exchange process and their ability to define the product. While this supports our earlier notion of the importance of good coordinating and communication skills for managers, it does not provide necessarily the important incentive for managerial motivation.

The Welfare State. The essence of the welfare state is government protected minimum standards of income, nutrition, health, housing and education, assured to every citizen as a political right and not a charity.[27] The welfare state is at once one of the great structural uniformaties of modern society and paradoxically one of its most striking diversities. The relationship between the government and a welfare client is not necessarily the same as the relationship between the government and other sections of society. Yet, the action is always legitimized by the government's responsibility to enhance the well being of its citizenry.[28] One author argues that the service state[29] which is pledged to serve rich and poor alike seems unable to promote the welfare of either

and that this is the result of a discrepancy between ideology and performance; a conflict between traditional values (ie. individualism, materialism, rationalism) and the impact of social and technological change.[30]

Public policy always reflects the ideology of the policy makers and to this extent we have no defined public policy for welfare. On a national level, expenditures for human resources are second only to military in both volume and growth. (One critic has termed this our need for external and internal security.)[31] On a state and local level, human resource expenditures often represent the largest hunk of the budget.

Consequently, we are in a national vacuum in terms of philosophy on public welfare expenditures and this effects both performance and effectiveness. It is becoming increasingly clear that this cannot be resolved by traditional social reforms and legislation, and the call for a basic reconstruction of our national priorities and institutions is becoming well heard.

For the manager in a public human service agency, this only adds injury to insult. Besides existing in a conflicting environment with an ill-defined task and little motivational incentives, he is working in a field which is not totally legitimized by the society it theoretically serves. The solution to this lies in a government for profit, and one that defines profit by meeting the needs of its citizenry. For the human service manager, this would mean that he is working towards a goal that is legitimized by the society that he lives in and that therefore his motivation to perform and to produce would be increased.

Instrument

The instrument, which are the skills and tools necessary for performing the tasks of management within the environment which it operates, have been the central focus of this study. As previously stated, our problem was that there was no coordination between what was required of social work students in school and what was required of them on the job. This translates basically into a skill definition; what skills are necessary for the performance of management or administrative jobs within human service agencies.

A major portion of the interview schedule was devoted to this task by asking the sample to rate skills in relation to their importance to their present position, and by trying to isolate the training or education that the respondents had received. It should be noted that they were not asked what they considered important, but what was important to the performance of their particular job. More than one respondent indicated to this interviewer that specific skills were important, but not particularly relevant to their present position. Consequently, our data reveals what is important to the performance of jobs in human service agencies and not necessarily the values or personal preferences of what individuals think should be important. Since our major research goal was based on a performance indicator (training social work students to perform on the job), this is perfectly appropriate. However, since it is also theoretically the role of educational institutions to stimulate progressive and new thinking, in other words not to act as a training ground but to initiate change, we have no way to judge from our interviewees' answers, the areas in which the school might have some influence in improving and making more productive what already exists.

Both our literature review and our data seems to focus in on two major areas which are essential for management or administrative positions. These may be broadly categorized as (1) skills, knowledge or experience which relate directly to personal attributes or (2) skills, knowledge or experience which relate directly to performance.

Personal Attributes. There can be no question that the personal characteristics of an individual in a management position in any organization, whether for profit or non-profit, public or private, human service or otherwise, are critical to the performance of that job.

Our interviewees consistently ranked "personal attributes" as the number one most essential general category in our study. Within this category, they identified abilities of an analytical, interpersonal and logical (level-headed) personality as essential 90% of the time. They also rated highly a commitment to human values, a responsibility to produce (output) as well as personal attributes related to leadership, innovation and drive.

Our literature review makes this point even stronger, by proposing that one must not look only at the qualifications of a manager but at his "intuition," and "flair."[32] A manager must have "innate abilities" which include the ability to absorb information and process it quickly and accurately. Additionally, a manager must have an above average "impact on others."[33] This same author perceives that a manager must have a good emotional base, which he translates to mean the ability to withstand stress.

These personal characteristics all fall under the broad range of "leadership" and our data and the literature both stress this conclusively. Moreover, the leadership should be action-centered, which may be

defined as achieving the task, building the team and developing the individual.[34] Accordingly, a manager must have a high level of drive and energy and thus a high level of motivation.

Thus, the personal ability of a manager to lead both in terms of getting the task done (product) and getting it done through the performance of other people (process) is critical. To be able to do this effectively, managers must be able to analyze a situation and quickly respond with resources and staff. And, to be able to do this effectively, he must personally have a high sense of motivation and responsibility combined with a good dose of innate judgement and common sense.

Performance. The instruments necessary for the performance of management roles in human service agencies have been generally categorized under two broad headings, personal attributes or performance. Performance, effectiveness and accountability are essentially the key terms to understanding the dilemma of management in public human service agencies.

The management literature speaks to these issues in a rather non-conclusive manner. "Result-oriented management," "managerial effectiveness," "output measures for services,"[35] are a few of the terms which are tossed about.

Our respondents also rated highly skills which are related to performance, many of which have already been noted which fall under the broad classification of personal attributes. A high value was also put on management and communication skills, planning, evaluation and report writing, yet a lesser emphasis was found in the more specific skill areas of financial or personnel management, resource development, proposal and grant writing. Thus, the fact that management skills are also defined

in a general rather than specific manner, further compounds a difficult situation.

This study did not attempt to measure the effectiveness with which skills are performed. There has been basically very little research done on managerial skills or what constitutes effective human service programs and both our literature review and our sample convey some confusion in this area.[36]

It has been suggested that it is difficult to assess skills and to relate them to success or failure.[37] It has also been suggested that the failure of human service programs is in part due to the fact that there are no incentives to build into these programs performance measures upon which to test for effectiveness.[38] It is in these two areas where the most critical need in management is today. If one can not assess what skills are necessary for the performance of management in human service agencies, this has a long lasting effect on the performance of those agencies in meeting the program demands of the public, as well as the accountability demands of their funding bodies. Furthermore, skill assessments of individuals in agencies has an effect on not only how they and the agency perform, but on organizational structure, decision making and organizational goals. One author has suggested that "human resources are like physical or money resources, one can only plan for their use in as much as one thinks they are there."[39]

This entire question of performance of public human service agencies seems to come down to two main areas, the people involved and the organization.

<u>People</u>. Our sample is generally well educated, although again they have a general education rather than a specific one. Most of our

sample, however, has been trained in management theory, management by objectives, organizational theory and problem analysis, all of which offer specific information applicable to performance questions. One might assume, thereby, that the problem is more in the organization than in the specific skills of the employees.

Organization. Issues related to organizational theory, development and operations appeared frequently in both our data and our literature review.[40] An amazing 73% of the interviewees had been educated in organizational theory and a full 80% considered it essential to their present position, the highest ratings in both major categories of general knowledge and change agent skills. Furthermore, respondents also rated highly skills essential to organizational development which included planning and development, evaluation, crisis management and report writing. It seems conclusive, thereby, that an understanding of the performance problem lies in an understanding of the nature of the organization.

It appears that this emphasis on organizational development is directly related to the bureaucratic and isolated nature of public human service agencies. Public agencies are almost always bureaucratic; power, authority and decision-making are centralized at the top, while the responsibility for implementing those decisions remains in the lower echelons. Besides the fact that decision-makers and implementors are usually worlds apart, the agency is often further segmented either philosophically, geographically or by task assignments. Moreover, between agencies with common objectives there is even less communication and more isolation with, for example, public welfare, children's services division and mental health often at odds with one another over program content and service delivery. Finally, client populations, who have to deal with all

of this, are frustrated by the lack of coordination, the incredible amount of red tape and the general slow, inefficient manner in which the entire system moves.

Thus, it is no surprise that a manager under these conditions spends a great deal of time in a coordinating and integrating role and the majority of time dealing with external forces. The result of all this is a management population which is frustrated, isolated and ineffective, who consequently have little motivation and low performance records. The question now becomes, what all of this means to the education of graduate social work students, who are either naive enough or ambitious enough to want to enter this field.

II. EDUCATION

A vast amount of human resources, fiscal resources and educational resources are wasted because of our inability to organize social systems that respond to social problems. Education, which has traditionally been associated as an isolated, academic institution, has now become the most popular social system for dealing with these inequities.[41] This is a result of many factors: (1) the society-educational establishments are being called on to directly participate in the problem solving process in addition to the analytical function which they have traditionally performed, (2) the student body - there is an increasingly larger number of students which are better qualified academically and experientially competing for fewer graduate slots and fewer jobs, (3) the economic situation - the overall shortage of financial resources directly effects programs, faculties and facilities of universities, (4) the community - a demand for programs and students which can make a

relevant contribution to the community which supports them. All of this is forcing the educational establishment to carefully select its priorities, its programs and its students to directly meet the new needs of both its internal and external communities.

For graduate schools of social work, this situation is particularily acute, for they have been traditionally charged with the task of training practitioners to respond to social problems. Moreover, the definition of what our social problems are has never been more critical, more immediate, more diversified and hence more controversial then they are today. Thus, this furthers the demand for this educational system to respond in an expedient, accurate and accountable manner.

In light of this, Performance in Management has attempted to respond both externally and internally to these developments. Recognizing that performance, effectiveness and accountability have become the major national and local issues in social welfare programs and that Portland State University School of Social Work did not have a formalized curriculum which addressed this demand, this study was conducted to isolate the skills that managers identified as important, as well as to determine how they spent their time and how they saw their role. The major research goal was to develop a curriculum based on this information with according performance measures upon which to test for competency. Thus, the remainder of this paper will briefly discuss education in terms of the three analytical tools used previously, goals, environment and instrument.

Goals (Roles, Tasks and Responsibilities)

The role of management has been previously defined as to make

knowledge more productive. It is interesting to note that we might also currently define the role of education as the same. This has not always been the case, but as our previous discussions have pointed out, the present thrust towards a more productive and positive link between knowledge and action, education and employment, services and performances, makes this definition very applicable for educational institutions.

The task of educational schools (law, medicine, business, education and social work) as opposed to academic schools (English, anthropology, history, sociology) is to train students to perform in a particular discipline. This is an important distinction for our purposes for their main emphasis is a performance standard based on a professional criteria, as opposed to an academic standard based on an intellectual evaluation. Consequently, although there is some debate on the appropriateness of universities functioning as training schools for external institutions, it appears perfectly legitimate that they should devote a major portion of their resources to this goal. A professional school is of no value either to the institution it operates within, the students it trains nor the community it serves, if it trains practitioners who are not equipped to practice in the field.

On the other hand, schools of social work have traditionally had a responsibility to train social workers to perform, among other things, a change agent role. Moreover, change, in general, has been a major overall dimension of our society for some time now.[41] Consequently, although the task of a professional school is to train students to perform on jobs, it is also the responsibility of this particular type of professional school to train students who can be advocates, activists, change agents, in other words, who will not merely function so that an agency perpetuates

itself, but who will initiate reforms.

Our literature review, including that portion which focused on business periodicals and journals, confirms that managers must be trained in change agent skills. Interestingly enough, our data did not. Thus, the educational and management dilemma, to make knowledge more productive, is hampered by an unwillingness in both institutions to do just that. Until change becomes a legitimate issue to be addressed, the relationship between knowledge and action, education and work, programs and effectiveness will remain a tenuous and independent one at best.

Environment

The Portland State University School of Social Work is the only such school in Oregon and has the major responsibility therefore for the training of social workers. Oregon, which has been progressive in environmental and ecological issues has not really developed a national reputation for forethought in social welfare areas.

Furthermore, the School, itself, is located in the largest urban area in Oregon and serves a population which comprises one-quarter of the state's total. It is located, therefore, in an urban university with associate responsibilities, thereby, to the community which surrounds it and to the State which funds it. This presents a potentially interesting and mutually beneficial position for both the school and the community. The school has the opportunity to enrich its curriculum content by the recruitment of community resources and the community has the occasion to further its goals by the use of university resources. Although this exchange already takes place to a limited extent, it could be enhanced by a more concise definition of the problem to be solved.

Since our major problem is the relationship between the academic and the work environment, community resources could be utilized to clarify what the issues, problems, procedures and expectations in the "real" world are, while students could be assigned specific community problem areas in which to exercise their talents. So, for example, rather than having a field assignment which is defined by an agency placement, students might pick a specific problem area. A model for this type of internship is the WICHE Program, where students are generally assigned specific tasks to perform within a certain time frame and are required to produce a final product. It would seem that by defining internships by a problem definition, rather than an agency definition, this would eliminate many of the inherent problems in the current field work structure for both the student and the agency.

Furthermore, it would address in part the dilemma of schools of social work which have the practical responsibility of training students for jobs and the academic responsibility for stimulating social change. One might view the course curriculum as fulfilling the former and the field assignment as serving the latter.

Within the university environment, there exists also many resources which have yet to be utilized by the School. The state interviewees, when asked informally for suggestions or comments to enhance the school's curriculum, almost always stated that the school should encourage students to take classes in other departments. Management classes, for example, could be taken within the business school, affording students not only the opportunity to interact and compete with other management students from varied disciplines, but also enabling them to learn management in a pure form, rather than in a specialized management for social workers

class. Our literature review indicates there is really only minimal differences between management practices in any type of organization. Additionally, it would allow the School to use its resources more effectively by eliminating the necessity of hiring an instructor to teach six social work students management practices.[42]

Thus, the school of social work operates within the State, local and university environments. It should learn to more effectively and productively employ these resources and in turn should invest its resources, its student population in effecting needed change. In this way, the school might further its training and advocacy roles and at the same time narrow the gap between the academic and work environments. Furthermore, the university would be able to address the void between the knowledge industry and the action industry and the community would be able to see a more clear relationship between services and performance, problems and solutions.

Instrument

The instruments for accomplishing these tasks within the respective environment centers around three main areas; (1) admission procedures, (2) curriculum content, and (3) field requirements.

Admissions Procedure. The current admission procedure at the school of social work operates around the basic premise that traditional social science educational and experiential background are the most appropriate standards for predicting success in graduate school.[43] Their objective, "success in graduate school" is, in this author's opinion, not in keeping with the goals of a professional school which centers on performance rather than academic indicators. Consequently, the school

has not alligned its admission objectives with its overall educational goals.

To this writer, this is probably the most crucial problem facing the School today. As our study has indicated, personal characteristics are of primary importance in assessing the success or failure of management practices. If the school recruits individuals whose personal attributes are based on traditional social work academic (ie. social science major) and experiential (ie. social work experience) criteria, they are not necessarily attracting the appropriate individuals for the tasks at hand.

It is a well established fact that there is little correlation between performance in school and performance on the job.[44] Educational and organizational institutions operate in very different realms and the fallacy of assuming that what one learns in one realm will transfer to another has been proven faulty time and time again. Furthermore, experience in social work agencies, which is a major criteria for the School was not confirmed by our study as at all important to the performance of those positions. Consequently, the two major areas in which the School evaluates applicants reflect both an internal discrepancy between admission goals (success in graduate school) and professional goals (training social work practitioners) and an external inconsistency by assuming that what one learns and how one performs in school will transfer to performance on the job.

The solution to this problem lies in evaluating applicants based on past broad performance standards. By looking at what they have actually done, within a broad rather than narrow perspective, we would eliminate

many of the inherent inequities in the current system.

For example, women, who completed their undergraduate degrees a few years ago, who have been out of the economically defined "work force" for a whole series of legitimate reasons, are seriously discriminated against. Although many have spent considerable time in volunteer associations, have, worked in essence, at home, their activities and performance because not directly connected to an economic incentive are not legitimized. They are given no credit, so to speak, in the current admission system, although their performance might very well be greater than the typically scholastically qualified admittee now accepted. Furthermore, if their volunteer activities were not of a "social work nature," they are even more seriously hampered.

Individuals, who also lead which for lack of a better definition will be termed "unconventional life styles," are also at a severe disadvantage. Little notice is given to life experience, whether it be political, military, traveling, survival or whatever, which may be a better indicator of performance potential than academic qualifications.

Consequently, the School tends to attract conventional academic, and experientially qualified individuals, who might or might not, be either motivated or interested in performing on the level of a professional school. It furthermore discourages those individuals, which have a broad based, general background, the type of which has been repeatedly confirmed by our study and literature review as being appropriate for the performance of management roles in human service agencies. Finally, it pays no attention to personal attributes, leadership, innovation, or drive which have been so continually emphasized by our sample and which are at the very core of the change-agent social work role.

Curriculum Content. The curriculum at the School of Social Work currently centralizes around three mandated areas, the "core" class, the "methods" class and the research requirement. The core class which proposes to cover social work issues from a micro, mezzo and macro perspective is a major first year requirement, which for some unknown reason carries double the weight of most classes, takes up a major portion of a first year student's schedule and is generally unpopular with students and faculty alike. Although it does propose to give a broad general background, it attempts to cover so much ground as to diffuse its impact. Generally, students are measured by traditional academic evaluation standards, with the exception of the mezzo section where students are required to identify and study a community problem, come up with a solution and present a final product. It is interesting that the School has choosen the mezzo (community) section to emphasize performance related to effectiveness, while ignoring it in the micro (individual) and macro (social) sections.

The research requirements are directly related to the practicum or thesis requisite, with the circular logic being that one must do a major research study to graduate and one must take two quarters of research to learn how to do this. With the exception of students that are particularly interested in research, these requirements have no basis in either fact nor fiction. Data analysis and research skills were consistently rated low by our respondents. Moreover, the skills utilized, analytical and conceptual abilities necessary in a long range research project are entirely different from the short range perceptual skills needed on a job. Finally, it normally results in no significant product, takes up

a lot of time which could be more productively spent and is, in sum, basically an academic exercise. It should be an option, rather than a requirement, and if chosen students should really get an opportunity to learn some research skills rather than the half-hearted manner it is handled presently.

Field Requirements. The field requirement has already been discussed at some length under the sub-section entitled "environment" of the section on education. Suffice it to say that the current field requirement presently represents one of the few rational spots in the School's entire repertoire in that it partially bridges the gap between the academic and work environments. While the premise it operates within is worthwhile, in reality the process itself often hinders the potentially positive effect of the experience. For example, field days are usually two days a week and are almost always broken up into the most difficult, unworkable and hence least effective combination - ie. Mondays and Thursdays or Monday and Wednesdays. This fragmented structure effectively blocks a student's chance for becoming actively involved in the agency and likewise frustrates the agency's ability to incorporate and utilize the student. As previously suggested, a field experience based on a problem definition rather than agency setting seems a more appropriate way to go.

III. SUMMARY - IMPLICATIONS

In sum, the implication of "Performance in Management" for the training of social work students interested in careers in management is, to coin a phrase, perfectly clear. Social workers aspiring to middle

management positions in human service agencies should have good basic skills especially those which relate to production or communication issues; they should have good personal and interpersonal skills, expecially those which relate to leadership, drive and innovation, and they should have a broad, general educational and experiential background as opposed to a specific, technical history.

What is rather uncomfortable about this picture of a "social worker manager" which has emerged is the gap left by the one unasked and unanswered question still to be explored. Will this type of manager be an effective manager? Or, to put it a little less tactfully, have we created a new picture of an effective manager or have we merely copied a snapshot of what already exists. We have asked a number of human service managers a number of questions pertaining to the skills, knowledge and personal attributes they identified as essential to the performance of their present job. At the same time, we have pointed out that both they and their job presently exist within a system which is terribly ineffective for a whole series of social, economic and political reasons not directly related to their capabilities as managers. In other words, we have basically solicited information from a population which is all involved in one system, the only system we have, but nevertheless not a very effective one.

It is suggested that it will be in the process of answering this question that the real implications of this study will be found. As stated previously, research implications do not stand or fall on the basis of the discovery of new information, but on whether they make clear and explicit the existing problem to be solved. A positive relationship between school and work, research and action, is contingent on the fact

that there is a clear picture of both the actual problem and the problem-solving process, which includes not only identifying the starting and ending points, but also the point beyond, hence, the ideal. To do this, one must ask the uncomfortable question if what we found is what we want, and explore that answer both within the reality constraints of a work environment and the social responsibilities of a professional school.

FOOTNOTES

1. Individuals employed by the State of Oregon in central agencies will be referred to in this report as the state-central sample.

2. Individuals employed by the State of Oregon in local agencies will be referred to in this report as the state-local sample.

3. A manager in this study is defined as an individual responsible for an agency component or program and have staff reporting directly to them.

4. An administrative staff position in this study is defined as an individual responsible primarily for his own work.

5. An agency with a multi focus in this study was defined as one with more than one program addressing more than one population group or problem area.

6. An agency with a single focus in this study was defined as one with primarily one program addressing one problem or population group.

7. Deborah I. Offenbacher, ed., Social Problems and Social Policy (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 31.

8. Ibid., p. 33.

9. Ibid., p. 32.

10. Ibid., p. 36.

11. Ibid., p. 93.

12. H. Ansoff and R. G. Brandenburg, "The General Manager of the Future," California Management Review 11 (Spring, 1969): 61.

13. Ibid.
See also analysis of findings.

14. Peter Drucker, "Management's New Role," Harvard Business Review 49 (March-April, 1971): 110.

15. Ibid.

16. David Lilienthal, Management: A Humanistic Art, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967).

17. Ibid.

18. Reginald Revans, Developing Effective Managers, (New York: Praeger Publications, 1971).

19. Hugo Uyterhoeven, "General Managers in the Middle," Harvard Business Review (Mar-April, 1973): 75-78.

20. Peter Drucker, "What we can Learn from Japanese Management," Harvard Business Review 49 (Mar-April, 1971): 110.

21. John Miner, "The Real Crunch in Managerial Manpower," Harvard Business Review (Nov-Dec, 1973): 146.

22. Ibid.

23. Chester C. Payne, "Middle Management Pay Performance," Conference Board Record 111 (September, 1966): 30-33.

24. Ibid.

25. David Reid, "How to Manage Manpower," Management Today (October, 1972)

26. Benson Shapiro, "Marketing for Non-Profit Organization," Harvard Business Review (Sept-Oct, 1973): 123.

27. Harold L. Wilensky, The Welfare State and Equality, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975): p. 1.

28. Offenbacher, Social Problems and Social Policy, p. 2.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Warren Lamb, "The Myth of the Super Manager," Time Review of Industry 4 (June, 1966): 22-24.

33. John Fraser, "The Front-Line Manager --- What Sort of Chap Must He Be," Supervisory Management (Autumn, 1972): 120-122.

34. Hilary Wilce, "Managers Learn How To Read," International Management (July, 1971).

35. Fraser, "The Front Front-Line Manager --- What Sort of Chap Must He Be"

36. Larry Griner, "What Managers Think of Participative Leadership," Harvard Business Review (Mar-April, 1973): 111-117.

37. Frank Heller, "A Study of British and American Managerial Skills," reviewed in Management Abstracts 11 (Jan-Mar, 1971): 33-35.

38. Alice M. Revlin, Systematic Thinking for Social Action, (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1970) p. 121.

39. Frank Heller, "A Study of British and American Managerial Skills," p. 35.

40. A. Etzioni, Managers and Experts, (Bedminster Press, 1966): 209.

41. Offenbacher, Social Problems and Social Policy, p. 93.

42. In the Spring of 1974, the author participated in such a class called "The Human Side of Management."

43. Admission standards for the Fall 1975 class gave a priority rating to a social work/social science educational background and a social work/human service experiential history.

44. Offenbacher, Social Problems and Social Policy, p. 95.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Abels, P., "The Managers are Coming! The Managers are Coming!", Public Welfare 31 (4) (1973): 13-15.

Ansoff, H., and Brandenburg, R.G., "The General Manager of the Future," California Management Review Vol. XI, No. 3 (Spring, 1969): 61-71.

Anthony, Peter, "Roles of Personnel Managers," Personnel and Training Management (May, 1968): 20-22 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 8, No. 3, (1968): 4.

Argento, R.C., "Behavioral Expectations as Perceived by Employing Agencies," Public Welfare 28 (2) (1970): 209-13.

Barry, Anthony, "Improving Managerial Effectiveness," Personnel and Training Management (March, 1968): 22 in Management Abstracts Vol. 8, No. 4 (1968): 13,14.

Bassett, Glenn A., "The Qualifications of a Manager," California Management Review Vol. XII, No. 2 (Winter, 1969): 35-44.

Beck, B.M., "Knowledge and Skills in Administration of an Anti-poverty Program," Social Work 11 (3): 162-166.

Boynton, Robert E., "Policies of the Successful Manager," California Management Review Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall, 1970): 38-44.

Brager, G.A., "Advocacy and Political Behavior," Social Work 13 (2), (1968): 5-15.

Conner, Samuel R., "R$_x$ for Managerial 'Shelf-Sitters'," Harvard Business Review (November-December, 1973): 113-120.

Corn, Hugh W., "Management as a Profession," Montana Business Quarterly Vol. 5, No. 4 (Fall, 1967): 47-68.

Deeks, John, "Job Specific Management Training," Industrial and Commercial Training (April, 1972): 176-182 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 12, No. 3 (1972).

De Hoyos, A. & De Hoyos, G., "The Future Direction of Social Work," and "The Professional Mobility of Social Work and its Middle Class Orientation," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 38 (1), (1968): 18-24.

Diehl, David W., "Multiple Cell Management," The Director (April, 1972): 89-92, abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 12 No. 3 (1972): 15.

Dietz, Stephen, "Get More Out of your Brand Management," Harvard Business Review (July-August, 1973): 127-136 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 13, No. 4 (1973): 11.

Drucker, Peter F., "Management's New Role," Harvard Business Review (November-December, 1969): 49-54.

Drucker Peter F., "What We Can Learn from Japanese Management," Harvard Business Review Vol. 49, No. 2 (March-April, 1971): 110 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 11, No. 2. 1.

Etzioni, A., "Managers and Experts," The Government of Associations (Bedminster Press): 209-13, 1966.

Fraser, John Munro, "The Front-Line Manager --- What Sort of Chap Must He Be," Supervisory Management, (Autumn, 1972): 120-122 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 13, No. 1 (1973): 18.

Glasner, Daniel M., "Patterns of Management by Results - A New Classification Scheme," Business Horizons, Vol. XII, No. 1 (Feb. 1969): 37-40.

Griner, Larry, "What Managers Think of Participative Leadership," Harvard Business Review (March-April, 1973): 111-117.

Handy, Charles B., "Exploding the Management Education Myth," European Business, No. 29 (Spring, 1971): 79-86.

Heller, Frank A., "A Study of British and American Managerial Skills," reviewed in Management Abstracts Vol. 11, No. 1 (Jan/Mar., 1971): 33-35.

Hey, A., and Rowbottom, R., "Task and Supervision in the Area Social Work," British Journal of Social Work, 1 (4), (1971): 435-453.

Hughes, Charles, "Assessing the Performance of Key Managers," Personnel, Vol. 45, No. 1 (Jan, 1968) abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 8, No. 4, (1968): 13.

Keen, Peter G.W. and McKenney, James L. "How Managers' Minds Work," Harvard Business Review (May-June, 1974).

Kendig, William L., "Developing Systematic Reporting Structures," Management Adviser (Jan-Feb., 1972): 20-26 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 12, No. 2 (1972): 1.

Lamb, Warren, "The Myth of the Super Manager," Time Review of Industry Vol. 4, No. 6 (June, 1966): 22-24 abstracted in Management Abstracts, Vol. 7, No. 2 (1967): 4.

Lauffer, A., "Continuing Education as Problem Focused Extension," Journal of Education for Social Work, 8 (3) (1972): 40-49.

Lawrence, Paul, "New Management Job: The Integrator," Harvard Business Review Vol. 45, No. 6 (Nov-Dec, 1967):

Lilienthal, David E., Management: A Humanistic Art, (New York, Columbia University Press): 1967.

Linkert, R., Leadership Styles and Employee Performance, (The Government of Associations - Bedminister Press): 1966.

Livingston, J. Sterling, "Myth of the Well-Educated Manager," Harvard Business Review (Jan-Feb., 1971): 79-89.

Lombard, George F.F., "Relativism in Organizations," Harvard Business Review (Mar-April, 1971): 55-65.

Lupton, Tom, Management and the Social Sciences, Lyon Grant and Green, London, 1969.

McArton, S. & McArton, D., "The Social Worker as a Public Servant," Social Worker-Travailleur School, 35(3): 196-204, 1967.

McFeely, Wilbur M., "Some Major Problems for Management Today and Tomorrow," The Conference Board Record Vol. VII, No. 9 (September, 1970): 41-45.

Miner, John B., "The Real Crunch in Managerial Manpower," Harvard Business Review (November-December, 1973): 146.

Miner, John B., Studies in Management Education (Springer Publishing Co., New York): 1965.

Mumford, Alan, "Self-development for Managers," Personnel Management (Jan, 1972) abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 12, No. 2 (1972): 1.

Nelson, J.C., "Uses of Systems Theory in Casework 1 and 11: A Proposal" Journal of Education for Social Work 8(3): 60-64, 1972.

Offenbacher, Deborah, ed., Social Problems and Social Policy, (New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, 1970) 1.

Payne, Chester C., "Middle Management Pay Performance," Conference Board Record Vol. III, No. 9 (Sept., 1966): 30-33 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 7, No. 1 (1967): 15.

Peterson, Richard B., "Chief Executives Attitudes: A Cross Cultural Analysis," Industrial Relations, Volume 10, No. 2 (May, 1971): 194-210.

Pfiffner, J.M. and Sherwood, F.P. Decision Theory and Its Applications, The Government of Associations (Bedminster Press): 123-7, 1966.

_____, The Process of Interaction, The Government of Associations (Bedminster Press): 103-8, 1966.

Phillips B., "A Director Examines the Director's Role," Social Work 9 (4): 92-99, 1964.

Porter, W. Thomas, "Professional Education for Management:, University of Washington Business Review (Summer, 1969): 44-48.

Reddin, W.J., "A 3-d Development in Management Style Theory," Personnel Management Vol. XLIX No. 379 (Mar., 1967): 20-28.

Rees, A., "Statistical Needs for Setting Policy," Monthly Labor Review 94(9): 43-45, 1971.

Reid, David, "How to Manage Manpower," Management Today (October, 1972) abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 13, No. 1 (1973): 15-16.

Revans, Reginald W., Developing Effective Managers, Praeger Publications, New York, 1971.

Revlin, Alice M., Systematic Thinking for Social Action, (Washington, D.C. The Brookings Institution, 1971).

Saunders, Derek, "The Valuation of Management as a Quantifiable Company Asset," Accountancy Age (July, 1970): 14 and "Valuing Human Assets: The Debate Continued" (a response by Victor Levine), Accountancy Age (August, 28, 1970): 8, 9 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 11, No. 1 (Jan/Mar, 1971): 14-15.

Shapiro, Benson P., "Marketing for Non-Profit Organization," Harvard Business Review (Sept-Oct, 1973): 123.

Sonthoff, Herbert, "What is the Manager," Harvard Business Review (Nov-Dec, 1964) Vol. 42 No. 6: 24.

Squires, S.J. "A Programme for Management Training and Development," Canadian Chartered Accountant Vol. 94 No. 5 (May, 1969): 305-310.

Tilles, Seymour, "The Manager's Job - A Systems Approach," Harvard Business Review Vol. 41, No. 1 (Jan-Feb, 1963): 73.

Turem, J.S., "The Call for a Management Stance," Social Work 19 (5): 615-623, 1974.

Uyterhoeven, Hugo E.R., "General Managers in the Middle," Harvard Business Review (Mar-April, 1972): 75-85.

Vega, John F., "The Mobile Manager at Mid-Career," Harvard Business Review (Jan-Feb, 1973): 115-119.

Waltz, T.H., "A Continuing Education Curriculum for the Graduate Social Worker," Journal of Education for Social Work 9(1): 68-78, 1973.

Weisbord, Marvin R., "Management in Crisis," The Conference Board Record Vol. VII, No. 2 (Feb, 1970): 10-16.

Wilce, Hilary, "Managers Learn How to Read," International Management (July, 1971) abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 11 No. 3: 42-45.

Wilemon, David L., "The Project Manager," Academy of Management Journal, (Sept, 1970): 269-282 abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 11 No. 2 (Apr-June, 1971): 12.

Wilensky, Harold L., The Welfare State and Equality (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

Wilson, Aubrey, "The Marketing of Professional Services," Marketing (Oct, 1972) abstracted in Management Abstracts Vol. 13, No. 1 (1973): 12.

Wrapp, E. Edward, "Good Managers Don't Make Policy Decisions," Harvard Business Review (Sept/Oct, 1967).

ADDENDUM

PERFORMANCE IN MANAGEMENT

CARD I

IDENTIFYING DATA	EXPERIENCE	SPECIFIC ED. OR TRAINING	CARD II RELATIVE IMPORTANCE (RANK)
1) Interviewee#_____ 4) Interviewer #_____ 5) Job Classification Manager_____ Staff_____ 6) Race & Sex M/W_____ M/NW_____ F/W_____ F/NW_____ 7) Governing Body State_____ Mult/Port._____ Malhuer/Ont._____ Jacksn./Med./ Ashland_____ 8) Service Area State_____ Local_____ 9) Problem Focus Multi_____ Single_____	Employment 10) Mo. in present position_____ 12) Yrs. in human svc. field_____ 14) Yrs. in planning or mngmt._____ 16)Yrs. since under-grad. degree_____ 18) Undergrad. degree Soc.Svc/SS_____ Other Bach._____ 19) Yrs. since last grad. degree_____ 21) Last grad. degree MSW_____ Other master_____ Doctoral_____ 22) Awareness in colleg of future mngmt. Yes_____ No_____	23) Comm. Dev._____ 24) Lab. Nego._____ 25) Legis. Proc._____ 26) Sys. Theory_____ 27) Organ'l. The._____ 28) Task Grp. Dyn._____ 29) Mngmt. The._____ 30) Data Sys._____ 31) Prof. Writng._____ 32) Pub. Present._____ 33) Intrvng. Techn._____ 34) Pblm. Anlys._____ 35) Pblm.Slvng. Tech._____ 36) Pln. The./Tech_____ 37) Progm. Mngmt._____ 38) Progm. Eval._____ 39) Fin. Mngmt._____ 40) Persnl. Mngmt._____ 41) Mngmt. by Obj._____ 42) Office Adm._____ 43) Other _____	Manager: 44) Persnl. traits and characteristcs._____ 45) Broad based knowledge of humn. svc. fld._____ 46) In depth knowledge re. specific human svc. field_____ 47) Broad based knowledge of mngmt._____ 48) In depth knowledge of specific management area_____ Admin. Staff: 49) Personal traits and characteristcs._____ 50) Broad based knowledge of h.s. field_____ 51) In depth knowledge re. specific h. s. field_____ 52) Broad based knowledge of mngmt._____ 53) In depth knowlege of specific mngt. area_____

CARD III

	TIME EXPENDITURE		
EXTERNAL FORCES	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
54) Total % of time spent interacting with external forces_____	56) Total % of time spent on program management. _____	58) Total % of time spent on financial management. _____	60) Total % of time spent on personnel management. _____
Rank relative to time spent in categorie: 62) __ Legislation 63) __ Adm. Bodies 64) __ Comm. groups & Organ. 65) __ Labor & Civil svc. negot.	Rank relative to time spent in categorie: 66) __ Progm. Plan/ Dev. 67) __ Progm. Adm. 68) __ Progm. Eval.	Rank relative to time spent in categorie: 69) __ Fin. Plan. 70) __ Rev. Dev. 71) __ Fin. Adm. 72) __ Fin. Eval.	Rank relative to time spent in categorie: 73) Persnl. Alocatn. tsk. __ assign. & needs asses 74) __ Recrut. selec. 75) __ Personnel Dev/Eval. 76) __ Affirm. Action

Interviewee #_____

IMPORTANCE TO PRESENT POSITION

1 = Essential
2 = Useful but not essential
3 = Neither essential nor useful

CARD IV	CARD V	CARD VI
EXPERIENCE	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	CHG. AGENT SKILLS
4) Broad _____	21) Interviewing _____	38) C. O. _____
5) Direct Service _____	22) Report writing _____	39) Org. Dev. _____
6) Plan/eval. _____	23) Proposal & grants _____	40) Pol. Action _____
7) Mngmt. _____	24) Public presentation _____	41) Resource Dev. _____
8) Business _____	25) Observational _____	42) Other (spec.) _____
9) Other (spec.) _____	26) Task Group meeting _____	_____
_____	27) Other (spec.) _____	_____
	_____	
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES	GEN. KNOWLEDGE	MANAGEMENT SKILLS
10) Leadership _____	28) System theory _____	43) Prog. oper. _____
11) Analytical _____	29) Organ. theory _____	44) Planning/Dev. _____
12) Interpersonal _____	30) Mngmt. theory _____	45) Evaluation _____
13) Output _____	31) Hum. Growth _____	46) Financial _____
14) Innovative _____	32) Sm. Group theory _____	47) Personnel _____
15) Committment to H. Va. _____	33) Legis. Process _____	48) Office Adm. _____
16) Drive _____	34) Legal Process _____	49) Crisis Mngmt. _____
17) Level headed _____	35) Political process _____	50) Data use _____
18) Phys. Appearance _____	36) Soc. Policy theory _____	51) Other (spec.) _____
19) Personal Growth _____	37) Other (spec.) _____	
20) Other (spec.) _____		

FIELD WORK FOR MSW STUDENTS
IN MANAGEMENT

Open ended questions

52) What recommendations do you have regarding field placements for MSW students who wish to go into management?
Probes regarding structure and experiences.

53) Would you be interested in having a student or students placed with you?
Probes regarding number and criteria.

54) Do you have any further recommendations for the school?